

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

EARL D. JOHNSON, JR.,

\*

Plaintiff,

\*

v.

\*

Civil Action No. RDB-21-855

WILLIAM BOHRER,

\*

SAMUEL CROTEAU,

\*

SGT. BRIAN SIMMONS,

\*

WARDEN RICHARD DOVEY, and

LT. DWAYNE DRAPER,

\*

Defendants.

\*\*\*

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

The self-represented plaintiff Earl D. Johnson filed an Amended Complaint on June 3, 2021, in response to this Court’s order providing him a second opportunity to amend his Complaint to specify how each Defendant was involved in alleged unlawful retaliation against him for filing a lawsuit. (ECF Nos. 8, 9).

Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires a pleading “give the defendant fair notice of what the plaintiff’s claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.” *Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N. A.*, 534 U.S. 506, 512 (2002) (quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957)). Under Rule 8(d)(1), each allegation in a complaint should be “simple, concise, and direct.” A pleading that offers labels and conclusions or a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action does not satisfy Rule 8’s basic pleading requirements. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)).

This Court is mindful that Johnson is a pro se litigant whose filings must be accorded liberal construction. *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007). A plaintiff must, however, “provide

sufficient detail” to show “a more-than-conceivable chance of success on the merits.” *Upstate Forever v. Kinder Morgan Energy Partners*, 887 F.3d 637, 645 (4th Cir. 2018) (citing *Owens v. Balt. City State's Attorney's Office*, 767 F.3d 379, 396 (4th Cir. 2014)). A court is not required to conjure up questions never squarely presented to it. *See Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F. 2d 1274, 1277 (4th Cir. 1985). The Amended Complaint does not sufficiently correct earlier noted deficiencies, and the summary and conclusory assertions in the Amended Complaint fail to provide sufficient facts to state cognizable federal claim.

Accordingly, it is this 8<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021, by the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, hereby ordered:

1. The Amended Complaint (ECF No. 9) IS DISMISSED;
2. The Clerk SHALL MAIL a copy of this Order to Plaintiff; and
3. The Clerk SHALL CLOSE this case.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
RICHARD D. BENNETT  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE